

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 WWW.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/829,094 04/20/2004 Shawn Owens 115/516 6014 09/10/2004 EXAMINER Jasper W. Dockrey BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE YEUNG, GEORGE CHAN PUI P.O. BOX 10395 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER CHICAGO, IL 60610 1761

DATE MAILED: 09/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|   |  | Application No.                          | Applicant(s)                |  |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary   |  | 10/829,094                               | OWENS, SHAWN                |  |
|   |  | Examiner                                 | Art Unit                    |  |
|   |  | George C Yeung                           | 1761                        |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  |  |  |                             |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). |  |  |                             |  |
| Status  |  |  |                             |  |
| 1)  | Responsive to communication(s) filed on  |  |                             |  |
|   |  | -<br>action is non-final.                |                             |  |
| 3)  | 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is |  |                             |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.   |  |  |                             |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |  |                             |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> <b>i</b> ⁄e/are pending in the application.  |  |  |                             |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |  |  |                             |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |  |                             |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.   |  |  |                             |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  |  |                             |  |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |  |  |                             |  |
| Application   | on Papers  |  |                             |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.   |  |  |                             |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  |  |  |                             |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |  |                             |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |  |  |                             |  |
| 11) $\square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |                             |  |
| Priority u  | nder 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |                             |  |
| 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:   |  |  |                             |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |  |  |                             |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  |  |  |                             |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage   |  |  |                             |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   |  |  |                             |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  |  |  |                             |  |
|   |  |  |                             |  |
| Attachment(   | •  |  |                             |  |
| 1)   Notice<br>2)   Notice  | of References Cited (PTO-892)<br>of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                 | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | (PTO-413)<br>ite.           |  |
| 3) 🔯 Inform   | Action Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 4/20/2004.                                  |  | atent Application (PTO-152) |  |

Art Unit: 1761

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Continuing-Data Objection

The continuing data appearing at page 1, lines 3-4 is objected to because it improperly identifies the present application as a "divisional application" of Serial No. 10/372,625 (hereinafter referred to as the "parent application"). Note that there was no restriction required in parent application Serial No. 10/372,625 between the method claims 1-20 of the present application and those apparatus claims allowed in the parent application. Thus it is not seen how the present application can be a "divisional application" of Serial No. 10/372,625. The change of "divisional" (page 1, line 3) to -- continuation -- would obviate this objection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention for the following reasons:

- 1. While the preamble of claim 16 calls for a method of forming shreds of cheese, claim16 fails to recite a positive manipulative step of forming shreds of cheese by cutting shreds of cheese from a front face of the cheese block with the at least one cutting blade. Thus claim 16 is indefinite and incomplete (see the cutting step set forth in claims 1 and 8.
- 2. In claim 20, line 2, the word -- by -- should be inserted before "extruding".

Application/Control Number: 10/829,094

Art Unit: 1761

# PROVISIONAL REJECTION, OBVIOUSNESS TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Claims 1-20 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-7 and 10-13 of U.S. Patent No. 6,340,490 (hereinafter referred to as "the '490 patent"). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-20 of the present application differ from claims 1-7 and 10-13 in the '490 patent primarily on the basis of an obvious variation in scope. Claims 1, 8 and 16 of the present application are of broader scope than claims 1, 10 and 12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,340,490 and thus the instant claims essentially read on the invention defined by the patent claims (i.e., method claims 1-7 and 10-13).

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number: 10/829,094

Art Unit: 1761

Page 4

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-20 are free of the prior art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George C. Yeung whose telephone number is (571) 272-1412. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 10:30 AM to

7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Milton Cano can be reached on (571) 272-1398. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

G. Yeung/af Septembre 8, 2004

> GEORGE C.YEUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Georg Many